

**BOARD OF REGENTS SUPPORT FUND**

**ENHANCEMENT PROGRAM**

Guidelines for the Submission of

**Traditional Enhancement Proposals**

**Proposals Due:**  
**October 26, 2016**  
**4:30 p.m. Central**

**FISCAL YEAR 2016-17**

Request for Proposals, Number 2016-05

P. O. Box 3677

Baton Rouge, Louisiana 70821-3677

(225) 342-4253

<https://web.laregents.org>

Revised 6/2016

# REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS, NUMBER 2016-05

## IMPORTANT NOTICES

**1. Inquiries about this RFP**

In accordance with R.S. 39:1503, written and oral inquiries about this request for proposals (RFP) will be accepted until 4:30 p.m. Central, **October 15, 2016**. Inquiries about the Traditional Enhancement Program RFP, Number 2016-05, should be directed to Mr. Bryan Jones, Enhancement Program Manager, [bryan.jones@la.gov](mailto:bryan.jones@la.gov), or at 225-342-4253. No inquiry will be accepted—whether written or oral—after that date. Operating in this manner ensures that all interested parties receive the same information.

**2. Suggestions for Improvements in this RFP**

The Board of Regents actively solicits constructive suggestions about ways in which this RFP can be improved. All such suggestions must be received no later than October 15, 2016 to be considered prior to the issuance of the next RFP.

**3. Availability of the RFP on the Internet**

As part of the Board's ongoing effort to streamline RFPs, and to ensure that this document is as widely disseminated as possible, this RFP is available on the Internet: <https://web.laregents.org> under the “Downloads” menu and “RFPs, Policies & Forms.”

**5. Proposal Submission Deadlines**

Electronic proposal submissions are due on October 26, 2016 by 4:30 p.m. Central. If this date falls on a holiday or weekend, proposals are due by 4:30 p.m. Central on the following working weekday.

All Enhancement Program proposals will be submitted through the Louisiana Online Grant Automation Network (LOGAN). This RFP excludes directions for submitting the proposal electronically. The applicant should print a copy of the submitted proposal for his/her own records. For help with electronic submission, e-mail [support@laregents.org](mailto:support@laregents.org).

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
I. General Information.....	1
A. Basis of Authority .....	1
B. Purposes of the Board of Regents Support Fund .....	1
C. Public Nature of Proposals Submitted.....	1
D. Enhancement Program Administrator; Questions About This RFP .....	1
II. Types of Enhancement Subprograms.....	1
III. The Traditional Enhancement Subprogram .....	2
A. Objectives.....	2
B. Eligibility Considerations.....	2
1. Eligible Faculty.....	2
2. Eligible Institutions.....	2
3. Eligible Activities .....	3
4. Eligibility of Duplicate Proposals.....	3
5. Eligible Disciplines.....	3
C. Monetary Limitations .....	4
D. Duration.....	4
E. Funds Available.....	4
F. Cost Sharing and Matching Commitments.....	4
G. Institutional Screening Committee .....	4
H. Assessment of Proposals by Out-of-State Experts .....	5
I. Final Selection of Proposals to be Funded .....	5
J. Debriefing.....	5
K. Timetable.....	5
L. Post-Award Evaluation of Funded Projects and Reports Required.....	5
M. Resubmission of Previously Unfunded Proposals and Eligibility of Continuation Proposals.....	5
IV. Procedures and Deadline for Submission of Proposals.....	6
V. Proposal Requirements and Format .....	6
Appendix A: Taxonomy of Disciplines	
Appendix B: Sample Proposal Evaluation Forms	

# FY 2016-17 BoR Traditional Enhancement Subprogram RFP

---

## I. GENERAL INFORMATION

### A. BASIS OF AUTHORITY

Article VII, Section 10.1, of the Louisiana Constitution established two funds in the State Treasury: the Louisiana Education Quality Trust Fund (hereinafter referred to as the Trust Fund) and the Board of Regents Support Fund (hereinafter sometimes referred to as the Support Fund). The Trust Fund was established with approximately \$550 million received from settlement of disputed oil and gas revenues generated in the so-called 8(g) section of the Federal Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act. Twenty-five percent of the interest earned from investment of money in the Trust Fund, as well as 25% of recurring 8(g) oil and gas revenues, will continue to be returned to the Trust Fund, until it reaches a cap of \$2 billion. Each fiscal year the remaining 75% of the interest earned and 75% of the recurring oil and gas revenues are placed in the Support Fund for appropriation by the Legislature.

### B. PURPOSES OF THE BOARD OF REGENTS SUPPORT FUND

On an annual basis, Support Fund money is divided equally between the Board of Elementary and Secondary Education (BESE) and the Board of Regents (hereinafter referred to as the Board) for higher education. According to Article VII of the Constitution, the funds available to higher education from the Support Fund are to be utilized " . . . as that money is appropriated by the Legislature and allocated by the Board of Regents for any or all of the following higher educational purposes to enhance economic development:

1. the carefully defined research efforts of public and private universities in Louisiana;
2. the endowment of chairs for eminent scholars;
3. the enhancement of the quality of academic, research, or agricultural departments or units within a university; and
4. the recruitment of superior graduate students."

The Article further stipulates that "the monies appropriated by the Legislature and disbursed from the Support Fund shall not . . . displace, replace, or supplant other appropriated funding for higher education. . . ."

Reflecting these Constitutional mandates, Board of Regents policies affirm that awards in all categories will be based on the following considerations:

1. the potential for the award to enhance the overall quality of higher education in Louisiana; and
2. the potential for the award to enhance the economic development of the State.

### C. PUBLIC NATURE OF PROPOSALS SUBMITTED

Once a proposal is received in the Board's office, it becomes public record. The Board's staff, of its own accord, will not disseminate proposals to individuals other than to external reviewers; however, applicants should be aware that, if a request for a proposal is made by the public (e.g., a faculty member or representative of the news media), a copy of the proposal, by law, must be provided.

### D. ENHANCEMENT PROGRAM ADMINISTRATOR: QUESTIONS ABOUT THIS RFP

Specific questions concerning this RFP and the requirements set forth herein should be directed to Mr. Bryan Jones, Enhancement Program Manager, at 225-342-4253 or [bryan.jones@la.gov](mailto:bryan.jones@la.gov). In compliance with R.S. 39:1503, questions will be accepted and answered until October 15, 2016. As soon as possible after that date, all questions asked about this RFP and all answers provided in response to these questions will be transcribed and posted on the Sponsored Programs website, <https://web.laregents.org>. To ensure that all parties receive the same information, no inquiries, whether oral or written, will be accepted after the deadline.

## II. TYPES OF ENHANCEMENT SUBPROGRAMS

The Enhancement Program consists of four components: the Endowed Two-Year Student Workforce Scholarships Subprogram; the Endowed Professorships Subprogram; the Endowed Undergraduate Scholarships for First-Generation College Students Subprogram; and the Traditional Enhancement Subprogram (including multidisciplinary). Potential applicants should be aware that: (1) the requirements for these programs vary, and (2) several sets of criteria have been established to evaluate these proposals. The Endowed Two-Year Student Workforce Scholarships, Endowed Professorships and Endowed Undergraduate Scholarships are explained in detail in other documents available on <https://web.laregents.org>.

**THIS RFP CONTAINS INFORMATION RELEVANT TO THE TRADITIONAL  
ENHANCEMENT SUBPROGRAM ONLY.**

**III. THE TRADITIONAL ENHANCEMENT SUBPROGRAM**

**A. OBJECTIVES**

Based on Constitutional and legislative mandates and policies adopted by the Board, Enhancement proposals will be considered whose objectives are to enhance the infrastructure of academic, research, or agricultural departments/units and to promote economic development.

The impact of the proposed project on the enhancement of departments/units--and on the State's economy--may be subtle, indirect, and delayed, or pronounced, direct, and immediate. Special consideration will be given to:

1. Projects that seek to leverage Statewide assets (e.g., the LONI Network or the Louisiana Universities Marine Consortium [LUMCON]), partnerships with other campuses or industry partners, projects with federal agencies, or strategic opportunities not otherwise available;
2. Projects that will be funded in part by an external agency; and
3. Projects that have a broad impact on students and/or faculty.

**B. ELIGIBILITY CONSIDERATIONS**

1. **ELIGIBLE FACULTY:** Only those individuals employed by an eligible Louisiana institution of higher education may act as principal or co-principal investigators. Individuals who are not employed by an eligible Louisiana institution of higher education (e.g., out-of-state scholars, scientists and/or engineers, or employees of industry) may serve as consultants on applications; however, they may not be listed as principal or co-investigators and must not be cited on the cover page of the proposal.

Principal investigators who are delinquent in submitting contractually required reports for prior or existing Board of Regents Support Fund and/or Federal awards managed by the Board of Regents Sponsored Programs Section are precluded from submitting a proposal in response to this RFP until the required report(s) has been received and accepted by the Board.

2. **ELIGIBLE INSTITUTIONS:**

- a. **SINGLE-CAMPUS PROPOSALS:** Departments/units at public two-year, four-year and special-purpose institutions, and regionally accredited independent institutions of higher education that are members of the Louisiana Association of Independent Colleges and Universities, are eligible to compete under the Traditional Enhancement Subprogram. Technical colleges are not eligible to compete except in collaboration with a two- or four-year eligible institution(s).
- b. **MULTI-INSTITUTIONAL PROPOSALS:** For applications that propose to share resources among several institutions, the following rules/statements apply:
  - i) Applications of this type must be submitted under the appropriate eligible discipline.
  - ii) The application must be submitted by a single lead institution. Partnering institutions must be referenced on the cover page of the application under the heading "Additional Institutions." Documentation that defines the role(s) of the partner institutions must be submitted as an appendix to the proposal (see RFP section V.C.).
  - iii) Only one comprehensive budget page for the project is to be submitted for each year of the proposal. Sub-contracted budgets for partnering institutions must be described in the budget justification and referenced in the work plan.
  - iv) If awarded, the grant will be managed fiscally by the lead institution.
- c. **SPECIAL MULTIDISCIPLINARY PROPOSALS:** For those applications which propose projects that are rooted in one of the five eligible disciplines but enhance the study of multiple disciplines and benefit multiple departments/units, the following rules/statements apply:

## FY 2016-17 BoR Traditional Enhancement Subprogram RFP

---

- i) The category “special multidisciplinary” must be selected on the proposal cover page.
  - ii) Applications must be firmly rooted in one of the five eligible disciplines, though projects may include disciplines and partner with departments/units that are not eligible during the year of submission.
  - iii) Applicants must identify only the single, root discipline on the cover page. However, the participation of partner disciplines should be clearly documented throughout the remaining sections of the application.
  - iv) All special multidisciplinary applications will be reviewed by a separate multidisciplinary panel composed of individuals with a broad range of expertise across the eligible disciplines.
  - v) Proposals for institution-wide enhancement projects that are rooted outside of the study of disciplines in individual departments/units are discouraged. Applicants may not claim that the project is eligible because many or all disciplines will indirectly benefit through the improvement of services available to the entire institution. Multidisciplinary projects, like all Enhancement projects, must directly enhance individual academic departments/units (see Constitutional language quoted in Section I.B.3).
3. **ELIGIBLE ACTIVITIES:** Any activity is eligible as long as the applicant can argue convincingly that it will enhance the infrastructure of the particular academic, research, or agricultural department(s) or unit(s) involved.
4. **ELIGIBILITY OF DUPLICATE PROPOSALS:** The same (or a very similar) proposal may not be submitted for funding consideration in more than one competition during the same cycle. In the event that duplicate or very similar proposals are submitted to multiple competitions in the same cycle, all affected proposals may be disqualified.
5. **ELIGIBLE DISCIPLINES:** In June 1988 the Board of Regents adopted a ten-year Strategic Plan for Higher Education's Portion of the Louisiana Education Quality Support Fund, which was subsequently updated in 1993, 1999, and 2007. The latter Plan sets forth the annual rotation by which certain disciplines are eligible to participate. Note that (1) the **topic** of the proposal is used to determine eligibility, not the academic training of the potential applicant(s); and (2) **eligible disciplines for FY 2016-17 through FY 2021-22 are listed below.**

### TABLE I: ELIGIBLE DISCIPLINES FOR TRADITIONAL AND UNDERGRADUATE ENHANCEMENT\*

#### GROUP I – ELIGIBLE FYs 2016-17, 2019-20

Business  
Chemistry  
Education  
Mathematics  
Physics/Astronomy

#### GROUP II – ELIGIBLE FYs 2017-18, 2020-21

Biological Sciences  
Computer and Information Sciences  
Engineering B (Industrial, Materials, Mechanical, etc.)  
Humanities  
Social Sciences

#### GROUP III – ELIGIBLE FYs 2018-19, 2021-22

Agricultural Sciences  
Arts  
Earth and Environmental Sciences  
Engineering B (Chemistry, Civil, Electrical, etc.)  
Health and Medical Sciences

\*See Appendix A for guidance in determining the sub-disciplines included in these larger groupings.

**C. MONETARY LIMITATIONS**

Except under extraordinary circumstances, applicants may request no less than \$5,000 and no more than \$1 million. The average award in the FY 2015-16 competition was approximately \$90,702 in Traditional Enhancement, with first-year awards ranging from \$10,000 to \$220,000. Large awards are not typical and, in the current budget environment, may be difficult to fund. Applicants are encouraged to analyze proposed budgets carefully and request only those items necessary to achieve project goals.

To limit the commitment of future Support Fund monies in the Enhancement Program, equipment may only be purchased in the first year. For projects that envision multi-year funding, these stipulations apply: (1) no project may be of more than two years in duration (except if granted an extension); (2) no project may request more than \$50,000 in the second year; and (3) a limit of \$300,000 is set for all second-year commitments.

**D. DURATION**

No proposal may seek more than two (2) years of support through the Traditional Enhancement Subprogram. Proposals of two years' duration that request no funding in year two, and particularly proposals of two years' duration that request support in year two up to the limit of \$50,000, will be funded only in exceptional circumstances and only when substantial justification is provided. When all other criteria for evaluation are equal, preference is given to one-year projects.

**E. FUNDS AVAILABLE**

The FY 2016-17 Support Fund Plan and Budget allocates \$3,087,678 for new Traditional Enhancement projects. The Support Fund has in recent years received substantially less income than projections indicated; thus the actual amount available for new awards may be reduced.

**F. COST SHARING AND MATCHING COMMITMENTS**

While institutional matching is not required to submit an Enhancement proposal, applicants and college/university officials should be aware that cost-sharing pledges included in the proposal are binding. For this reason the Board strongly encourages campuses to make only commitments that can realistically be met. Discounts on equipment purchases are not eligible for inclusion as institutional match.

Cost sharing and matching commitments of any kind (e.g., private sector, federal, institutional) that are pledged in the proposal must be honored in full if the proposal is funded at the requested level. Depending upon consultants' recommendations, matching commitments may have to be honored in full even if the award level is reduced. Support Fund monies will not be forwarded until appropriate written assurances of all matches and cost sharing promised in the proposal have been received, reviewed and approved by Board staff. Institutional approval is granted by submission of the proposal electronically to the Board through each institution's Office of Sponsored Programs (OSP) and is a certification to the Board that the fiscal agent is aware of the claimed commitment(s) and has determined said commitment(s) to be consistent with all applicable guidelines, regulations, and statutes. Similarly, the fiscal agent's signature, which is required on the budget page(s) of funded projects, is a certification to the Board that commitments pledged in the proposal have been honored. All matching funds must meet the same tests of allowability as Support Funds requested.

**G. INSTITUTIONAL SCREENING COMMITTEE**

Proposals should be carefully screened by a campus committee to ensure that: (1) no conflict of interest exists (as defined in the "Code of Governmental Ethics," R. S. 1950, as amended, Title 42, Chapter 15); and (2) only the most meritorious proposals from each campus, which meet objectives and eligibility requirements as defined in this RFP and which fulfill the goals of the Enhancement Program, are submitted to the Board.

Submission of the proposal by the OSP is considered a guarantee that no conflict of interest exists and that the proposal: (1) has been reviewed and approved for submission to the Board by all appropriate institutional officials who regularly are required to review proposals submitted for external review, including the submitting organization's authorized fiscal officer; (2) has met the objectives, eligibility requirements, and all other appropriate criteria as set forth in this RFP (e.g., the department or unit is eligible to submit a proposal in that year); (3) is in the format required by the Board; and (4) where appropriate, has been reviewed by campus officials within a particular system where

## FY 2016-17 BoR Traditional Enhancement Subprogram RFP

similar types of projects might be ongoing (e.g., the Director of the Agricultural Experiment Station and the Dean of the College of Agriculture).

### **H. ASSESSMENT OF PROPOSALS BY OUT-OF-STATE EXPERTS**

All proposals submitted in Traditional Enhancement will be subject to external review by an appropriate panel(s) of experts. The Board selects and engages the services of out-of-state experts in the eligible disciplines. Teams of experts representing the eligible disciplines individually assess and collectively rank proposals in the appropriate discipline in the Traditional Enhancement Subprogram; a separate team will evaluate proposals in the special multidisciplinary category.

Proposals will be rated on the extent to which they meet specified criteria. (See rating forms for Enhancement proposals in Appendix B.) Only those proposals that receive ratings from 70-100 will be eligible to compete for Enhancement funds. Only in exceptional circumstances will the Board fund proposals that receive a rating of 69 or less.

### **I. FINAL SELECTION OF PROPOSALS TO BE FUNDED**

After receiving recommendations from out-of-state experts, the Board determines which proposals will be funded.

### **J. DEBRIEFING**

A copy of the composite rating form for each proposal reviewed will be included in the complete consultants' report(s) published in April each year at <https://web.laregents.org> under the Downloads link. This is the only debriefing information that is available for Traditional Enhancement proposals.

### **K. TIMETABLE**

Contingent upon Board and Legislative action, the following schedule for submission, assessment, and approval of grants will apply for FY 2016-17. **If deadline dates fall on a Saturday, Sunday, or holiday, the deadlines will be extended until 4:30 p.m. Central of the next working weekday.**

July 2016	Request for proposals issued
October 15, 2016	Last day that applicants may ask questions about the RFP
<b>October 26, 2016, 4:30 p.m. Central</b>	Deadline for receipt of Traditional Enhancement proposals through LOGAN (including multidisciplinary)
November 2016 – March 2017	Proposals reviewed by out-of-state experts
April 2017	Reports and recommendations of out-of-state experts published
April 2017	Final action by the Board
May and June 2017	Contracts negotiated and executed

### **L. POST-AWARD EVALUATION OF FUNDED PROJECTS AND REPORTS REQUIRED**

The Board of Regents requires that institutions receiving monies from the Support Fund report periodically on the utilization of those monies. All programs supported by the Fund will be reviewed at least annually. Data and information collected for review will vary depending upon the type of activity involved, but all information necessary to assess the effectiveness of each project will be gathered. As appropriate, the services of out-of-state experts may be utilized in the evaluation process.

Periodically, the Board conducts a comprehensive assessment of the effectiveness of each funded project as part of a general review of academic programs in the relevant disciplines. At a minimum, annual and final Progress and Financial Status reports will be required of the awarded campus.

### **M. RESUBMISSION OF PREVIOUSLY UNFUNDED PROPOSALS AND ELIGIBILITY OF CONTINUATION PROPOSALS**

Submission of a proposal in a previous cycle does not mean that the applicant is relieved of the responsibility of submitting a full proposal if he or she wants the same or a very similar proposal to be considered in the current funding cycle. Proposals that are resubmissions must compete on an equal basis with all other proposals. An applicant submitting a continuation proposal must fully explain in the proposal narrative why he or she wishes to continue the project and summarize the progress. The applicant must also indicate on the cover page that the submission is a continuation request by indicating the contract number of the previous project so Board staff is aware that additional



## FY 2016-17 BoR Traditional Enhancement Subprogram RFP

information is included with the continuation proposal. Failure to include the additional information could result in disqualification of the proposal for noncompliance. **The Board discourages the submission of continuation requests in the Traditional Enhancement Subprogram.**

### IV. PROCEDURES AND DEADLINE FOR SUBMISSION OF PROPOSALS

All proposals submitted to the Board must be complete upon submission and must be received electronically through LOGAN. Modules for submitting Enhancement Program proposals are available on LOGAN, which may be accessed at <https://web.laregents.org> by clicking "LOGAN" on the menu at the top. **Paper originals or copies will not be accepted.** Note that the proposal submission process includes two steps: submission by the PI to the campus, and campus approval with submission to the Board or Regents; a proposal cannot be accepted by the Board until both steps are completed.

**A. COMPLETION AND SUBMISSION OF MATERIALS ON OR BEFORE CITED DEADLINES:** Submission deadlines are absolute; all campus work on the proposal, including final approval and submission to the Board of Regents by the designated campus office, must be completed on or before the deadline date and time. The online proposal submission system is programmed to close at the deadline(s) cited in this RFP.

A proposal sent to the Board of Regents through LOGAN may be released upon request of the submitting institution if additional changes are needed, provided such request is made before the deadline for receipt. A released proposal must be resubmitted through LOGAN prior to the deadline to be eligible for funding consideration.

**B. CONFIRMATION OF RECEIPT:** After the applicant submits the completed proposal to his/her designated campus office via LOGAN, he/she will receive a sequence of three emails: (1) immediately following the applicant's submission to the campus, confirmation of receipt of the electronic proposal by the campus; (2) following institutional approval and submission, confirmation that the Regents have received the proposal; and (3) as soon as possible after the subprogram submission deadline, an indication of whether the proposal has been submitted in compliance with RFP instructions or disqualified for lack of compliance. The campus will be copied on all confirmations.

**NOTE: Applicants are responsible for ensuring that the proposal is complete and correct upon submission to the Board, and no changes may be made to any proposal after the submission deadline. Disqualification of a proposal and/or any reviewer misunderstandings that occur because proposal contents (including all required forms) are incomplete, out of order, or contain incorrect information are solely the responsibility of the applicant.**

**Electronic proposals must be approved by the institution's  
Office of Sponsored Programs (OSP) or other designated office  
and submitted to the Board of Regents via LOGAN  
by 4:30 p.m., Central, October 26, 2016.**

### V. PROPOSAL REQUIREMENTS AND FORMAT

**GENERAL FORMAT STIPULATIONS:** All narrative sections of the proposal must be presented in a single PDF document with pages numbered, 1-inch margins at the top, bottom and on each side, and in type no smaller than 12 point. Forms must be completed and proposals submitted via LOGAN.

The requirements and format for Traditional Enhancement proposals must be followed closely. Proposals that do not adhere to these guidelines may be disqualified for noncompliance. Each proposal must include the following information:

**A. COVER PAGE:** Each item on the cover page must be completed. If the proposal is a continuation request, the additional information requested must be provided. **NOTE:** There are two types of Enhancement proposals: equipment and non-equipment. Board staff classifies proposals as equipment related **if over 50% of the total BoR funds requested are allocated for equipment, supplies, and software.** Non-equipment proposals are those in which less

## FY 2016-17 BoR Traditional Enhancement Subprogram RFP

---

than 50% of BoR funds requested are allocated for equipment, supplies, and software. The cover page must reflect this determination, as each type of proposal is scored differently (see the evaluation forms in Appendix B).

- B. PROJECT SUMMARY:** The project summary, limited to 2,500 characters (including spaces), should be a concise description of the project, containing a clear statement of goals and objectives and an outline indicating how the project will operate. The project summary should be informative to other individuals in the field of submission and should explain how the project meets Enhancement Program objectives.
- C. NARRATIVE AND BIBLIOGRAPHY:** The narrative may not exceed fifteen (15) pages. Biographical sketches, budgets, and budget justifications are not considered part of the narrative section. The narrative should be succinct and avoid repetition. Information applicable in multiple places may be referenced by title of section. If a section does not apply, include the heading and mark "not applicable." Reviewers will assign points based on the quality and specificity of each section. The maximum points that can be assigned to each section are noted on the following pages. Proposals that do not conform to page limitations or the prescribed outline may be disqualified.

For multi-institutional proposals, explain as appropriate in each of the following sections existing and/or pending agreements relative to shared funding, resources, and arrangements by which the various institutions propose to share the benefits of the project. Documentation must be provided describing the exact nature of the agreements between/among the institutions.

### **1. THE CURRENT SITUATION [total point value = 10]**

This section explains the institutional context and the perceived need. It should open with a brief description of the institution, students served, department(s)/units involved, and student clientele. The applicant should not assume that reviewers are acquainted with the institution and its programs. Additionally, this section should describe the relevant resources of the department/unit(s) to answer the question: "Is there an adequately supported program into which the present project will fit?" This section should identify the need that the project addresses and answer the question: "What is currently missing from the curricula or research program, is not being accomplished effectively, or would significantly expand its performance, effectiveness, and/or efficiency?"

#### **a. Institutional Description (no points)**

Describe the institution and department/unit(s) that benefit from or support the proposed project, including its/their mission, faculty, students, and relevant institutional or departmental resources.

#### **b. Rationale for Project (5 points)**

Summarize briefly the need for the proposed project and its role in enhancing the affected department(s)/unit(s) and/or curricula.

#### **c. Impact on Existing Resources (5 points)**

Describe the manner and the extent to which the project will complement and improve upon the existing resources of the department/unit(s).

### **2. THE ENHANCEMENT PLAN [total point value: equipment proposals = 56; non-equipment proposals = 66]**

This section should contain a detailed description of the specific developments and activities intended. This portion of the narrative should enable reviewers to judge the suitability and quality of the planned enhancement(s).

#### **a. Project Goals and Objectives (10 points for both equipment and non-equipment proposals)**

Define project goals and measurable objectives.

#### **b. Work Plan of Proposed Project (equipment = 21 points; non-equipment = 20 points)**

Describe specific activities to be undertaken to achieve the goals and objectives described above. Indicate the person(s) who will conduct each activity. Provide a schedule of activities that lists benchmarks to be accomplished throughout the term of the project. Describe how each objective will be evaluated. **See also section 2.g below.**

## FY 2016-17 BoR Traditional Enhancement Subprogram RFP

---

**c. Evidence of Potential to Achieve Recognized Eminence at the Regional, National, or International Level Commensurate with Degree Offerings and/or Functions (equipment = 5 points; non-equipment = 8 points)**

Explain thoroughly how the proposed project will propel the department(s)/unit(s) to a high level of eminence, or help to maintain a current high level of eminence, commensurate with degree offerings and/or functions.

**d. Impact on Curriculum and Instruction (equipment = 5 points; non-equipment = 8 points)**

Explain the impact which the proposed project will have on the variety and quality of curricular offerings and instructional methods within the affected department(s) or unit(s). As appropriate to current thinking in the specific field(s) or discipline(s) of the proposed project, activities to reform undergraduate education and/or teacher preparation are encouraged.

**e. Impact on Quality of Students (equipment = 5 points; non-equipment = 8 points)**

Explain how the proposed project will enhance the ability of the participating department(s) or unit(s) to attract and/or retain students of high quality, particularly high-quality students from Louisiana.

**f. Impact on Faculty Development (equipment = 5 points; non-equipment = 8 points)**

Explain how the project will contribute to improving the quality and effectiveness of faculty teaching. Improvement of faculty pedagogical practices within the context of current thinking on reform of undergraduate education and teacher preparation specific to field(s) or disciplines(s) of the proposed project is encouraged.

**g. Project Evaluation (equipment = 5 points; non-equipment = 4 points)**

For the entire project, devise a plan that determines the extent to which the applicant(s) will assess/evaluate the project and the degree to which it has achieved its goal(s).

**3. EQUIPMENT [For equipment proposals only. Total point value = 10]**

This section should answer the questions: "Is each item requested actually needed to implement this development, is it the right piece of equipment for the job, and is the request appropriate for the department/unit? If the request appears not to be appropriate for the department/unit, has the applicant provided evidence that the request merits special consideration?"

**a. Equipment Request (6 points)**

List each item requested, with price information. Logical groupings of items should be made, with each entry cross-referenced to the budget page. Special arguments may be needed to explain requests for: (1) equipment of a quality or cost not usually encountered in research or instruction; (2) equipment that is to be fabricated rather than purchased as a unit; or (3) purchases that might appear to be at variance with the academic setting in which the project operates. Explain the reasoning behind: (1) choosing the particular equipment and (2) the alternatives that were considered and rejected. If an award is made, any items regarded as ineligible, not germane, or inadequately justified will not be funded.

The purpose of this part of the proposal is to establish the precise relationship between the plan described in the previous sections and the item(s) of equipment requested. This section must indicate briefly the manner in which each major equipment item will be used to affect the appropriate aspect(s) of the enhancement plan described previously.

**b. Equipment on Hand for Project (1 point)**

This section should answer the question: "Has there been a thorough survey of the current equipment inventory and does the proposal plan to make full use of it?" Major equipment on hand that will be available for the project but that is not included in this request should be itemized and explained.

**c. Equipment Housing and Maintenance (3 points)**

This section should answer the question: "Is a reasonable plan presented to ensure a maximum usable lifetime for the equipment?" Describe arrangements to house and maintain the equipment. **Please note that Support Fund monies cannot be used to maintain equipment, whether existing or purchased through the Support Fund. Also note that Support Funds cannot be requested to purchase extended-term service contracts,**

## FY 2016-17 BoR Traditional Enhancement Subprogram RFP

---

long-term warranties or maintenance agreements beyond those automatically included as part of the standard equipment cost. Such items should be funded through institutional or other match. If multidisciplinary, interdepartmental, or interinstitutional use of equipment is proposed, describe the plan for effective utilization.

#### 4. FACULTY AND STAFF EXPERTISE [total point value = 12]

Identify those individuals who will conduct and administer the project, define their roles, and provide their qualifications for undertaking the specific responsibilities assigned to them. Special attention should be given to the Principal Investigator, since accomplishment of the project depends on this person's knowledge of the discipline, the curriculum, and the equipment.

Briefly describe arrangements for special training of existing personnel and/or for acquisition of needed additional support personnel. These arrangements should reflect the fact that Support Fund monies may not be used to pay faculty from the submitting campus to provide or participate in training on equipment furnished by Support Fund grants, or any other form of training. **Training should be part of the institutional match.** In the case of interinstitutional projects, training should be a part of the matching funds provided by the consortium of universities.

**NOTE:** A Biographical Sketch form must be completed for the Project Director and other involved senior personnel. See section V.H.

#### 5. ECONOMIC AND/OR CULTURAL DEVELOPMENT AND IMPACT [total point value = 12]

This section of the proposal describes the short- and long-term benefits of the project to Louisiana's economic and/or cultural development.

##### a. Relationships With Industrial/Institutional Sponsors (2 points)

Explain the manner in which the project will assist in establishing a new relationship, or strengthening an existing relationship, with one or more industrial/institutional sponsors (e.g., private business, trade organization, professional organization, non-profit or community organization, another university or consortium of universities, statewide higher education resource, or federal government agency). Explain the manner in which support for the proposed project would enhance prospects of securing additional external sources of funding.

##### b. Promotion of Economic Development and/or Cultural Resources (10 points)

Describe the manner in which the proposed project will assist the submitting department(s)/units(s) in promoting or enhancing the economic development of the State of Louisiana. Provide information on both short-term and long-term benefits. In the case of projects with significant potential academic/cultural contributions or from which an economic benefit is not expected, explain the manner in which the proposed project will contribute to and benefit the academic and/or cultural resources of Louisiana in both the long and short term.

#### 6. ADDITIONAL FUNDING SOURCES AND EVIDENCE OF COLLABORATION (0 points)

Confirm all resources from collaborating partners by a signed letter describing the form of the commitment to the project. Additional resources may be in the form of cash or in-kind contributions.

Indicate the resources (time and expertise) that appropriate and authorized institutional personnel will provide to the project. Example: The Director of Institutional Research will provide data, store data generated by the project and assist with internal monitoring and evaluation of the project. If appropriate, include a description of statewide resources (e. g., the LONI Network or LUMCON) to be used in the project.

#### **D. PREVIOUS BoR SUPPORT FUND AWARDS:**

If either the prospective Principal Investigator or Co-Principal Investigator has participated in an award from any Support Fund program during the previous nine (9) years, the proposal must describe the earlier project(s) and outcomes in sufficient detail to permit a reviewer to reach an informed conclusion regarding the value of the results achieved. The following information must be included in this summary statement: (1) Principal Investigator's name,

## FY 2016-17 BoR Traditional Enhancement Subprogram RFP

---

type of award, amount of award, and period of support; (2) title of the project; (3) a summary of the results of the completed work; and (4) an explanation of the manner in which the current proposal is related to the previous award.

**E. BUDGET AND BUDGET NARRATIVE/JUSTIFICATION:** (Also see Section III.F of the RFP relative to cost sharing and matching commitments.)

1. An itemized budget must be submitted in the appropriate LOGAN section. A corresponding budget narrative will be uploaded separately, which should fully explain every item for which the expenditure of Support Funds is requested and institutional/private match monies are committed. All funds for which a commitment from an external source has been pledged and that are cited in the narrative section of the proposal must be listed on the budget page and explained in the budget narrative. Matching funds should be specified as “in cash” or “in kind.”
2. Use State contract prices for equipment purchases, if applicable.
3. If ongoing availability of funds after the proposed contract terminates is essential to its long-term success/feasibility (e.g., equipment purchased with Support Fund money requires continued funding for operation and maintenance), the applicant must provide a Future Funding Plan in the budget narrative.

**F. DISALLOWED BUDGETARY ITEMS:**

Support Fund monies cannot be used for ongoing operational costs of existing or proposed programs, entities, or projects. As indicated in Section I.B of this RFP, "Purposes of the Board of Regents Support Fund," the Louisiana Constitution stipulates that "[The] monies appropriated by the Legislature and disbursed from the Support Fund shall not...displace, replace, or supplant other appropriated funding for higher education..." Applicants must make a case in their proposals that what they are proposing does not violate this stipulation. Applicants should also be aware that Support Fund Program staff will make panels of out-of-state evaluators aware of this Constitutional prohibition, as well as the current economic climate for higher education in Louisiana. Panels will then be asked to develop recommendations relative to whether providing Support Fund money for specific proposals under serious consideration would violate this Constitutional stipulation. **Indirect costs may not be requested from the Traditional Enhancement Subprogram, but may be provided as institutional match.**

Also, only with substantial justification and under exceptional circumstances will the Board allocate Enhancement Program funds for maintenance of equipment, whether existing or purchased through the Support Fund. Long-term maintenance contracts for equipment cannot be requested from the Support Fund; these expenses should be provided as match.

Applicants should also note that the scope of the program does not permit: (1) construction of facilities; (2) routine renovation or upgrading; (3) paying faculty from the submitting university to train other faculty at the same university, or faculty at other universities who are a part of a multi-institutional project; (4) purchase of standard motorized vehicles such as cars, vans, boats, etc.; or (5) purchase of standard office furniture or routine office equipment (e.g., copiers, desk chairs). Support Fund money may be requested to furnish specialized office equipment and vehicles for educational and research purposes and essential to the success of a particular project (e.g., remote tables for computer work stations or unmanned aerial research vehicles for data collection). The proposal must detail and justify the specific project-related educational and/or research uses of requested equipment, objectives and activities.

Equipment and supplies purchased with Support Fund monies may not be given to grant participants (faculty, students, teachers, etc.) as personal property during or after the grant period. **Support Fund money may not be requested for equipment or other expenditures, such as faculty stipends, additional compensation, or overload pay, for K-12 teachers or Louisiana Technical College partners.** These individuals are eligible for funds through the BESE portion of the Support Fund, so may not receive BoRSF monies. (See also section V.G below.)

The scope of the Enhancement Program does not normally permit funds to be used for entertainment costs, with the exception of meals for consultants or other professionals brought to the State as part of a funded project. Only under exceptional circumstances and with compelling justification may Support Funds be used for receptions, group meals for faculty and students, refreshments, performers, and other entertainment. All meal charges must comply with State rates as set forth by the Louisiana State Travel Office.

## FY 2016-17 BoR Traditional Enhancement Subprogram RFP

---

Support may not be requested for shortfalls or deficits in budgets, scholarships or tuition, augmentation of salaries of individuals pursuing regularly assigned duties, or unspecified contingencies; and finally, funds may not be requested for anticipated centers or institutes that require Board approval prior to their establishment and that have not been approved prior to submission of the proposal.

Any item determined to be ineligible by this RFP shall not be funded, regardless of the recommendations of the external consultants.

Discounts received for equipment purchases may not be counted as part of the institutional match.

**NOTE ON MEMBERSHIP DUES:** Only under exceptional circumstances may Support Fund dollars be used to support institutional memberships to business, technical, and/or professional organizations. Individual faculty memberships to any of the above are disallowed.

### **G. FUNDS FOR PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATORS AND SUPPORT PERSONNEL:**

**Except in compelling and unusual circumstances, BoRSF funds may not be requested for faculty or staff support.** If the Project Director feels strongly that such expenditures are warranted, partial salary support may be requested **as release time** in proportion to the amount of time each affected employee is expected to contribute to the project, and may not exceed 25% of academic-year salary plus two months of summer support. Support may be provided **only as release time or summer salary** and in no event may charges to the Support Fund exceed the percentage share of base salary pledged to the project. **Faculty and staff may not receive stipends, overload pay or additional compensation for work performed outside of regular duties or work hours, and may not be paid on a contract basis as consultants to a funded project.**

If salary support of any kind is requested, the applicant must certify that: (a) Support Fund monies will not supplant State funds; and (b) full-time faculty and staff will not, under any circumstances, receive in excess of 100% of their regular salaries through Support Funds. In addition, the budget narrative must provide detailed explanations of the type of salary requested, regular salary level, percentage of effort committed, and justification in terms of project work to be performed for each individual requesting support. Institutions may provide salary support and additional compensation through in-cash or in-kind match.

While requests may be made to fund a full- or part-time faculty or staff position, such requests require substantial justification and a firm commitment from the submitting institution to continue the position after the award period ends. The applicant should specify a duration that the position will be needed to fulfill the long-term goals of the campus, department/unit and/or project. Staff positions created to implement the award must serve a longer-term need met by hiring new individual(s), even on a limited basis, and may not be requested solely to support the grant.

**H. BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCH:** Provide information necessary for reviewers to evaluate the capabilities and experience of key personnel. The Biographical Sketch form must be completed for the Principal Investigator and all senior project personnel. Regarding publications, biographical sketches should only include relevant books, peer-reviewed publications, and manuscripts formally accepted for publication. Works in progress or submitted for publication should not be included.

**I. CURRENT AND PENDING SUPPORT:** Complete the form for the Principal Investigator and all Co-Principal Investigators. This form is not required for technicians and visiting scholars.

**J. PROJECT ACTIVATION DATE AND ANTICIPATED DATE OF COMPLETION:** The project activation date is June 1, 2017 and termination date is June 30, 2018 for one-year projects or June 30, 2019 for two-year projects. No-cost extensions may be requested to complete activities per Louisiana R.S. 39:1514. This statute specifies that “contracts or amendments to existing contracts issued to institutions of higher education under the authority of the Board of Regents to award grants for educational purposes with funds available from the Louisiana Education Quality Support Fund, the Louisiana Fund, and the Health Excellence Fund may be entered into for periods of not more than six years. However, such contracts may be extended beyond the six-year limit up to an additional two-year period provided no additional costs are incurred.” Extensions to Enhancement awards are limited to a maximum of two (2) years.

## APPENDIX A

### TAXONOMY OF DISCIPLINES USED IN THE BOARD OF REGENTS SUPPORT FUND PROGRAMS

#### NATURAL SCIENCES - BIOLOGICAL

##### Agriculture

- 0101 Agricultural Economics
- 0102 Agricultural Production
- 0103 Agricultural Sciences
- 0104 Agronomy
- 0105 Animal Sciences
- 0106 Fishery Sciences
- 0107 Food Sciences
- 0108 Forestry and Related Sciences
- 0109 Horticulture
- 0110 Resource Management
- 0111 Parks and Recreation Management
- 0112 Plant Sciences  
(Except Agronomy, see 0104)
- 0113 Renewable Natural Resources
- 0114 Soil Sciences
- 0115 Wildlife Management
- 0199 Agriculture - Other

##### Biological Sciences

- 0201 Anatomy
- 0202 Biochemistry/Biophysics
- 0203 Biology
- 0204 Biometry
- 0205 Botany
- 0206 Cell and Molecular Biology
- 0207 Ecology
- 0208 Embryology
- 0209 Entomology and Parasitology
- 0210 Genetics
- 0211 Marine Biology
- 0212 Microbiology
- 0213 Neurosciences
- 0214 Nutrition
- 0215 Pathology
- 0216 Pharmacology
- 0217 Physiology
- 0218 Radiobiology
- 0219 Toxicology
- 0220 Zoology
- 0299 Biological Sciences - Other

#### NATURAL SCIENCES - BIOLOGICAL (CONTINUED)

##### Health and Medical Sciences

- 0601 Allied Health
- 0602 Audiology and Speech Pathology
- 0603 Chiropractic
- 0604 Dental Sciences
- 0605 Environmental Health
- 0606 Epidemiology
- 0607 Health Science Administration
- 0608 Immunology
- 0609 Medical Sciences
- 0610 Nursing
- 0611 Optometry
- 0612 Osteopathic Medicine
- 0613 Pharmaceutical Sciences
- 0614 Podiatry
- 0615 Pre-Medicine
- 0616 Public Health
- 0617 Veterinary Science
- 0699 Health and Medical Sciences - Other

#### NATURAL SCIENCES - PHYSICAL

##### Chemistry

- 0301 Chemistry, General
- 0302 Analytical Chemistry
- 0303 Inorganic Chemistry
- 0304 Organic Chemistry
- 0305 Pharmaceutical Chemistry
- 0306 Physical Chemistry
- 0399 Chemistry - Other

##### Physics and Astronomy

- 0801 Astronomy
- 0802 Astrophysics
- 0803 Atomic/Molecular Physics
- 0804 Nuclear Physics
- 0805 Optics
- 0806 Planetary Science
- 0807 Solid State Physics
- 0899 Physics and Astronomy - Other

NATURAL SCIENCES - COMPUTATIONAL

Computer and Information Sciences  
0401 Computer Programming  
0402 Computer Sciences  
0403 Data Processing  
0404 Information Sciences  
0405 Microcomputer Applications  
0406 Systems Analysis  
0499 Computer Sciences - Other

Mathematical Sciences  
0701 Actuarial Sciences  
0702 Applied Mathematics  
0703 Mathematics  
0704 Probability and Statistics  
0799 Mathematical Sciences - Other

NATURAL SCIENCES - EARTH/ENVIRONMENTAL

Earth, Atmospheric, and Marine Sciences  
0501 Atmospheric Sciences  
0502 Environmental Sciences  
0503 Geochemistry  
0504 Geology  
0505 Geophysics and Seismology  
0506 Paleontology  
0507 Meteorology  
0508 Oceanography  
0599 Earth, Atmospheric, and  
Marine Sciences - Other  
4403 Environmental Design  
4405 Landscape Architecture

ENGINEERING - A

Engineering - Chemical  
1001 Chemical Engineering  
1002 Pulp and Paper Production  
1003 Wood Science  
1099 Chemical Engineering - Other

Engineering - Civil  
1101 Architectural Engineering  
1102 Civil Engineering  
1103 Environmental/Sanitary Engr.  
1199 Civil Engineering - Other

ENGINEERING - A (CONTINUED)

Engineering - Electrical and Electronics  
1201 Computer Engineering  
1202 Communications Engineering  
1203 Electrical Engineering  
1204 Electronics Engineering  
1299 Electrical and Electronics  
Engineering - Other

ENGINEERING - B

Engineering - Industrial  
1301 Industrial Engineering  
1302 Operations Research  
1399 Industrial Engineering - Other

Engineering - Materials  
1401 Ceramic Engineering  
1402 Materials Engineering  
1403 Materials Science  
1404 Metallurgical Engineering  
1499 Materials Engineering - Other

Engineering - Mechanical  
1501 Engineering Mechanics  
1502 Mechanical Engineering  
1599 Mechanical Engineering - Other

Engineering - Other  
1601 Aerospace Engineering  
1602 Agricultural Engineering  
1603 Biomedical Engineering  
1604 Engineering Physics  
1605 Engineering Science  
1606 Geological Engineering  
1607 Mining Engineering  
1608 Naval Architecture and  
Marine Engineering  
1609 Nuclear Engineering  
1610 Ocean Engineering  
1611 Petroleum Engineering  
1612 Systems Engineering  
1613 Textile Engineering  
1699 Engineering - Other



## SOCIAL SCIENCES

### Anthropology and Archaeology

- 1701 Anthropology
- 1702 Archaeology

### Economics

- 1801 Economics
- 1802 Econometrics

### Law (5102)

### Political Science

- 1901 International Relations
- 1902 Political Science and Government
- 1903 Public Policy Studies
- 1999 Political Science - Other

### Psychology

- 2001 Clinical Psychology
- 2002 Cognitive Psychology
- 2003 Community Psychology
- 2004 Comparative Psychology
- 2005 Counseling Psychology
- 2006 Developmental Psychology
- 2007 Experimental Psychology
- 2008 Industrial and Organizational Psychology
- 2009 Personality Psychology
- 2010 Physiological Psychology
- 2011 Psycholinguistics
- 2012 Psychometrics
- 2013 Psychopharmacology
- 2014 Quantitative Psychology
- 2015 Social Psychology
- 2099 Psychology - Other

### Sociology and Social Work

- 2101 Demography
- 2102 Sociology
- 5001 Social Work

### Social Sciences - Other

- 2201 Area Studies
- 2202 Criminal Justice/Criminology
- 2203 Geography
- 2204 Public Affairs and 4801 Public Administration
- 2205 Urban Studies and 4406 Urban Design
- 2299 Social Sciences - Other
- 4401 Architecture
- 4402 City and Regional Planning
- 4404 Interior Design
- 5101 Interdisciplinary Program

## SOCIAL SCIENCES (CONTINUED)

### Communications

- 4501 Advertising
- 4502 Communications Research
- 4503 Journalism and Mass Communication
- 4504 Public Relations
- 4505 Radio, TV and Film
- 4506 Speech Communication
- 4599 Communications - Other

### Home Economics

- 4601 Consumer Economics
- 4602 Family Relations
- 4699 Home Economics - Other

### Library and Archival Sciences

- 4701 Library Science
- 4702 Archival Science

## ARTS

### Arts - History, Theory, and Criticism

- 2301 Art History and Criticism
- 2302 Music History, Musicology, and Theory
- 2399 Arts - History, Theory, and Criticism - Other

### Arts - Performance and Studio

- 2401 Art
- 2402 Dance
- 2403 Drama/Theatre Arts
- 2404 Music
- 2405 Design
- 2406 Fine Arts
- 2499 Arts - Performance and Studio - Other

### Arts - Other

- 2999A Arts - Other
- 5101A Interdisciplinary Programs

## HUMANITIES

### English Language and Literature

- 2501 English Language and Literature
- 2502 American Language and Literature
- 2503 Creative Writing
- 2599 English Language and Literature - Other

## HUMANITIES (CONTINUED)

### Foreign Language and Literature

- 2601 Asiatic Languages
- 2602 Foreign Literature
- 2603 French
- 2604 Germanic Languages
- 2605 Italian
- 2606 Russian
- 2607 Semitic Languages
- 2608 Spanish
- 2699 Foreign Languages - Other

### History

- 2701 American History
- 2702 European History
- 2703 History of Science
- 2799 History - Other

### Philosophy

- 2801 All Philosophy Fields

### Humanities - Other

- 2901 Classics
- 2902 Comparative Language and Literature
- 2903 Linguistics
- 2904 Religious Studies; 4901 Religion; and 4902 Theology
- 2999H Humanities - Other
- 5101H Interdisciplinary Programs

## EDUCATION

### Education - Administration

- 3001 Educational Administration
- 3002 Educational Supervision

### Education - Curriculum and Instruction

- 3101 Curriculum and Instruction

### Education - Early Childhood

- 3201 Early Childhood Education

### Education - Elementary

- 3301 Elementary Education
- 3302 Elementary-level Teaching Field

## EDUCATION (CONTINUED)

### Education-Evaluation and Research

- 3401 Educational Statistics and Research
- 3402 Educational Testing Evaluation and Measurement
- 3403 Educational Psychology
- 3404 Elementary and Secondary Research
- 3405 Higher Education Research

### Education - Higher

- 3501 Educational Policy
- 3502 Higher Education

### Education - Secondary

- 3601 Secondary Education
- 3602 Secondary Level Teaching Fields

### Education - Special

- 3701 Education of the Gifted
- 3702 Education of the Handicapped
- 3703 Education of Special Learning Disabilities
- 3704 Remedial Education
- 3799 Other Special Education Fields

### Education - Student Counseling & Personnel Services

- 3801 Personnel Services
- 3802 Student Counseling

### Education - Other

- 3901 Adult and Continuing Education
- 3902 Bilingual/Crosscultural Education
- 3903 Educational Media
- 3904 Junior High/Middle School Education
- 3905 Pre-Elementary Education
- 3906 Social Foundations
- 3907 Teaching English as a Second Language/Foreign Language
- 3999 Other Education Fields

## BUSINESS

### Accounting

- 4001 Accounting
- 4002 Taxation

### Banking and Finance

- 4101 Commercial Banking
- 4102 Finance
- 4103 Investments and Securities

### Business, Administration and Management

- 4201 Business Administration and  
Management
- 4202 Human Resource Development
- 4203 Institutional Management
- 4204 Labor/Industrial Relations
- 4205 Management Science
- 4206 Organizational Behavior
- 4207 Personnel Management
- 4299 Business Management - Other

### Business - Other

- 4301 Business Economics
- 4302 International Business Management
- 4303 Management Information Systems
- 4304 Marketing and Distribution
- 4305 Marketing Management and Research
- 4399 Business Fields - Other

## **APPENDIX B**

### **SAMPLE PROPOSAL EVALUATION FORMS**

#### **Form 6.11**

Evaluation Form for Enhancement Proposals  
Primarily Requesting Equipment

#### **Form 6.12**

Evaluation Form for Enhancement Proposals  
Primarily Requesting Non-Equipment Related Support  
(e.g., Curricular Revisions, Colloquia)

BOARD OF REGENTS SUPPORT FUND ENHANCEMENT PROGRAM, FISCAL YEAR 2016-17

RATING FORM FOR TRADITIONAL AND UNDERGRADUATE ENHANCEMENT PROPOSALS  
**PURCHASE OF INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT**

**INSTRUCTIONS:** The completed evaluation form should represent the consensus of the expert members of the review panel and, as such, must reflect the final decisions of that panel. Review this form and the program guidelines prior to reading the proposal. The higher the score, the more clearly the proposal satisfies the criterion under consideration.

**A. THE CURRENT SITUATION—10 points**

- YES \_\_\_\_\_ NO \_\_\_\_\_
- \_\_\_\_\_ of 5 pts.      A.1      Has the applicant adequately described the institution and unit(s)/department(s) that will benefit from the project, especially in terms of mission, faculty, students, and relevant institutional or departmental resources?
- \_\_\_\_\_ of 5 pts.      A.2      To what extent will the proposed project enhance the affected department(s)/unit(s) and/or curricula?
- \_\_\_\_\_ of 5 pts.      A.3      To what extent will the project complement and improve upon existing resources of the department(s) or unit(s)?

**B. THE ENHANCEMENT PLAN—56 points**

- of 10 pts.      B.1      Are the goals and objectives clearly stated? Are they realistic? Are the objectives measurable? Can the objectives be completed within the timeframe detailed in the proposal?
- of 21 pts.      B.2      Does the work plan sufficiently describe the activities that will be undertaken to achieve the goals and objectives of the proposal with responsible individuals listed for each activity and a schedule of// activities with benchmarks to be accomplished?
- of 5 pts.      B.3      To what extent will the proposed project propel the department(s)/ unit(s) into attaining a high level of regional, national, or international eminence--or maintaining a current high level of eminence-- commensurate with degree offerings and/or functions?
- of 5 pts.      B.4      To what extent will the proposed project have an impact on the variety and/or quality of curricular offerings and instructional methods within the affected department(s) or unit(s)?
- of 5 pts.      B.5      To what extent will the proposed project enhance the ability of the department(s) or unit(s) to attract and/or retain students of high quality, particularly high quality students from Louisiana?
- of 5 pts.      B.6      To what extent will the project contribute to improving the quality and effectiveness of faculty teaching and improve faculty pedagogy?
- of 5 pts.      B.7      To what extent does the proposal indicate how the PIs will assess/evaluate the degree to which the project has achieved its goals?

**C. EQUIPMENT—10 points**

- of 6 pts.      C.1      To what extent has the proposal established a relationship between the enhancement plan activities and the type of equipment requested? Is the equipment well-justified? Will it significantly enhance the existing technological capability of the department(s)/units(s)? Does it reflect current and projected trends in technology?
- of 1 pt.      C.2      Is there a thorough survey of the current equipment inventory and does the proposal plan to make full use of the equipment?
- of 3 pts.      C.3      To what extent does the proposal present a reasonable plan to ensure a maximum usable lifetime for the equipment? Are housing and maintenance arrangements for equipment adequate?

**D. FACULTY AND STAFF EXPERTISE—12 points**

\_\_\_\_\_ of 12 pts      D.1      Are the faculty and support staff appropriately qualified to implement this project? If special training will be required for faculty and/or other personnel, has an appropriate plan been developed?

**E. ECONOMIC AND/OR CULTURAL DEVELOPMENT AND IMPACT—12 points**

\_\_\_\_\_ of 2 pts.      E.1      To what extent will the project assist in establishing a new relationship or strengthen an existing relationship with one or more industrial/institutional sponsors (e.g., private business, trade organization, professional organization, non-profit or community organization, another college or university or consortium of colleges and universities, federal government agency)?

\_\_\_\_\_ of 10 pts.      E.2      To what extent will the project assist the submitting department(s)/unit(s) in promoting or enhancing economic, cultural and/or academic development and/or resources in Louisiana?

**F. PREVIOUS SUPPORT FUND AWARDS—No points assigned**

YES \_\_\_ NO \_\_\_\_\_      F.1      If the Project Director or Co-Project Director has received previous Support Fund support, has it been adequately documented?

**G. TOTAL SCORE (NOTE: Proposals with a total score below 70 will not be recommended for funding.)**

\_\_\_\_\_ of 100 points

**SPECIFIC BUDGETARY RECOMMENDATIONS**

Requested Amount \$ \_\_\_\_\_ Recommended Amount \$ \_\_\_\_\_

I agree to maintain in confidence any information, documentation and material of any kind (hereinafter referred to as "Material") included in this proposal; I further agree not to disclose, divulge, publish, file patent application on, claim ownership of, exploit or make any other use whatsoever of said "Material" without the written permission of the principal investigator. To the best of my knowledge, no conflict of interest is created as a result of my reviewing this proposal.

Reviewer's Name and Institution: \_\_\_\_\_

Reviewer's Signature: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_

(Form 6.11, rev 2015)

BOARD OF REGENTS SUPPORT FUND ENHANCEMENT PROGRAM, FISCAL YEAR 2016-17

RATING FORM FOR TRADITIONAL AND UNDERGRADUATE ENHANCEMENT PROPOSALS  
**REQUESTS OTHER THAN EQUIPMENT PURCHASES (e.g., Colloquia, Curricular Revisions, etc.)**

**INSTRUCTIONS:** The completed evaluation form should represent the consensus of the expert members of the review panel and, as such, must reflect the final decisions of that panel. Review this form and the program guidelines prior to reading the proposal. The higher the score, the more clearly the proposal satisfies the criterion under consideration.

**A. THE CURRENT SITUATION—10 points**

- YES \_\_\_\_\_ NO \_\_\_\_\_
- \_\_\_\_\_ of 5 pts.      A.1      Has the applicant adequately described the institution and department(s)/unit(s) that will benefit from the project, especially in terms of mission, faculty, students, and relevant institutional or departmental resources?
- \_\_\_\_\_ of 5 pts.      A.2      To what extent will the proposed project enhance the affected department(s)/unit(s) and/or curricula?
- \_\_\_\_\_ of 5 pts.      A.3      To what extent will the project complement and improve upon existing resources of the department(s)/unit(s)?

**B. THE ENHANCEMENT PLAN—66 points**

- \_\_\_\_\_ of 10 pts.      B.1      Are the goals and objectives clearly stated? Are they realistic? Are the objectives measurable? Can the objectives be completed within the timeframe detailed in the proposal?
- \_\_\_\_\_ of 20 pts.      B.2      Does the work plan sufficiently describe the activities that will be undertaken to achieve the goals and objectives of the proposal with responsible individuals listed for each activity and a schedule of activities with benchmarks to be accomplished?
- \_\_\_\_\_ of 8 pts.      B.3      To what extent will the proposed project propel the department(s)/unit(s) into attaining a high level of regional, national, or international eminence--or maintaining a current high level of eminence—commensurate with degree offerings and/or functions?
- \_\_\_\_\_ of 8 pts.      B.4      To what extent will the proposed project have an impact on the variety and quality of curricular offerings and instructional methods within the affected department(s) or unit(s)?
- \_\_\_\_\_ of 8 pts.      B.5      To what extent will the proposed project enhance the ability of the department(s) or unit(s) to attract and/or retain students of high quality, particularly high quality students from Louisiana?
- \_\_\_\_\_ of 8 pts.      B.6      To what extent will the project contribute to improving the quality and effectiveness of faculty teaching and improve faculty pedagogy?
- \_\_\_\_\_ of 4 pts.      B.7      To what extent does the proposal indicate how the PIs will assess/evaluate the degree to which the project has achieved its goals?

**C. FACULTY AND STAFF EXPERTISE—12 points**

- \_\_\_\_\_ of 12 pts.      C.1      Are faculty and support staff appropriately qualified to implement the project? If special training will be required for faculty and/or other personnel, has an appropriate plan been developed?

**D. ECONOMIC AND/OR CULTURAL DEVELOPMENT AND IMPACT—12 points**

- \_\_\_\_\_ of 2 pts.      D.1      To what extent will the project assist in establishing a new relationship or strengthen an existing relationship with one or more industrial/institutional sponsors (e.g., private business, trade organization, professional organization, non-profit or community organization, or another college or university or consortium of colleges and universities, federal government agency)?
- \_\_\_\_\_ of 10 pts.      D.2      To what extent will the project assist the submitting department(s)/unit(s) in promoting or enhancing economic, cultural and/or academic development and/or resources in Louisiana?

**E. PREVIOUS SUPPORT FUND AWARDS—No points assigned**

YES \_\_\_ NO \_\_\_ E.1 If the Project Director or Co-Project Director has received previous Support Fund support, has it been adequately documented?

**F. TOTAL SCORE (NOTE: Proposals with a total score below 70 will not be recommended for funding.)**  
\_\_\_ of 100 points

**SPECIFIC BUDGETARY RECOMMENDATIONS**

Requested Amount \$ \_\_\_\_\_ Recommended Amount \$ \_\_\_\_\_

I agree to maintain in confidence any information, documentation and material of any kind (hereinafter referred to as "Material") included in this proposal; I further agree not to disclose, divulge, publish, file patent application on, claim ownership of, exploit or make any other use whatsoever of said "Material" without the written permission of the principal investigator. To the best of my knowledge, no conflict of interest is created as a result of my reviewing this proposal.

Reviewer's Name and Institution: \_\_\_\_\_

Reviewer's Signature: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_

(Form 6.12, rev 2015)